

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed **March 29, 2004** (Paper No. 3). Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By the forgoing amendment, the specification and claims have been amended. Additionally, new claims 28-54 have been added. No original claims have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-54 are currently pending for the Examiner's consideration.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated the allowance of claims 12-18 and the presence of allowable subject matter in claims 6-11 and 23-27. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance claims 12-18 and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6-11 and 23-27.

Accordingly, claims 6 and 23 have been amended herein and each rewritten as an independent claim. Claims 7-11 depend from now-independent claim 6, and claims 24-27 depend from now-independent claim 23. Therefore, based on the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, claims 6-18 and 23-27 should be in condition for immediate allowance following entry of the present amendment.

The recent Office Action also contains a statement of reasons for the allowance or allowability of claims 6-18 and 23-27. Applicant agrees with the Examiner's conclusions regarding patentability, without necessarily agreeing with or acquiescing in the Examiner's reasoning. In particular, Applicant believes that these claims are allowable because the prior art fails to teach, anticipate or render obvious the invention as claimed, independent of how the invention is paraphrased. Again, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the

allowance claims 12-18 and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6-11 and 23-27.

Next, the Office Action objected to the drawings as not showing all the features of the invention recited in claims 6, 12 and 23. Consequently, Applicant has attached hereto a proposed amendment to Fig. 1 to illustrate additional subject matter recited in the indicated claims. Support for the changes to Fig. 1 is found in the specification as originally filed at, for example, paragraph 12 and claims 6, 12 and 23. No new matter is added.

Following approval and entry of this amendment to Fig. 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings will be in compliance with all applicable rules. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

With regard to the prior art, claims 1-5 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,298,400 to Candelore ("Candelore"). For at least the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites:

An apparatus for providing a function to a host terminal, comprising:  
a point of deployment (POD) module that can be connected to the host; and  
an interface between the POD module and the host, wherein the interface selectively provides Direct Memory Access (DMA) between the POD module and the host terminal.

Similarly, claim 19, recites:

A method for providing a function to a host terminal, comprising:  
connecting a point of deployment (POD) module to the host via an interface;  
and  
selectively integrating the POD module and the host so as to provide Direct Memory Access (DMA) between the POD module and host.


In contrast, Candelore fails to teach or suggest providing Direct Memory Access between a POD module and host terminal. Instead, Candelore merely teaches that “the host may want to initialize the POD module, or read some status values. This can be done by issuing an address on the address bus 340 on the host side which is translated to the address bus 342 on the POD module side.” (Col. 5, lines 47-50). Thus, Candelore clearly does not teach or suggest providing DMA between the POD and host as claimed.

"A claim is anticipated [under 35 U.S.C. § 102] only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-5 and 19-22 based Candelore should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The newly added claims are thought to be patentable over the prior art of record for the same reasons that claims 6, 12 and 23 have been indicated as allowable. Therefore, examination and allowance of the newly added claims is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is thought to be clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks is courteously solicited. If any fees are owed in connection with this paper which have not been elsewhere authorized, authorization is hereby given to charge those fees to Deposit Account 18-0013 in the name of Rader, Fishman & Grauer PLLC. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven L. Nichols  
Registration No. 40,326

DATE: 23 June 2004

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.  
Managing Partner, Utah Office  
**Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC**  
River Park Corporate Center One  
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150  
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066  
(801) 572-7666 (fax)